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Ammons, T., Booker, J., & Killmon, C. (1995). The effects of time of day on student attention and achievement*.* *(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 384 592)*

This article describes a study conducted to find out how timeofday affects student attention and achievement. The researchers studied 36 fifth-grade students in a small, rural school in Virginia, and gave them Learning Styles Inventories (LSIs) for each child to determine his personal time of day preference. Students were taught science lessons and tested on them in both morning and afternoon sessions. The results of the study suggest that time of day does affect student achievement, and students taught at times that matched their learning style preferences scored significantly higher on lesson-related quizzes.

Barron, B., Henderson, M., & Spurgeon, R. (1994). Effects of time of day instruction on reading achievement of below grade readers. *Reading Improvement, 31,* 59-60.

This article describes a study conducted by the researchers in which they selected 128 underachieving students in grades one through four in a Chapter I Reading Program. Teachers in the study conducted reading instruction with each control group in the morning and with each experimental group in the afternoon. All groups took pre- and post-tests. The researchers found that students who received instruction in the afternoon did better than students who received instruction in the morning.

Beck,C. (2001). Matching teaching strategies to learning style preferences. *The Teacher Educator, 37,* 1-15.

This article analyzes three widely used learning styles inventories (4MAT System, McCarthy, 1987; Dunn's LSI, 1992a & 1992b; and Renzulli and Smith's LSI, 1998) and matches them to the most compatible teaching strategies. The author concludes, “The sensitive teacher recognizes the need to plan lessons that address the students' preferred learning styles.”

Bloom, A. (2007). Pupils choose their shift. *The Times Educational Supplement, 4743,* 14.

This article describes a school schedule pilot program in Plymouth, England in which four of the area’s primary schools allow students to choose the times they prefer to attend school. Students who work better in the morning can choose to start school at 7.45 a.m. and finish at 1 p.m., while those who prefer to sleep in have the option of beginning lessons at 11 a.m. and working through until 4.30 p.m.

Borchetta, J., & Dunn, R. (2010). Helping parents understand how children learn. *Momentum, 41*, 40-43.

With research collected through a study in one of the authors’ school and other elementary and middle schools, the authors wrote this article to assert that the learning styles of members of the same family can differ drastically, and teachers and parents need to be aware of individual learning styles to help students, and not compare them to their siblings. The authors go through the elements of the Dunn and Dunn learning styles model, and notes that time-of-day preference can be shared by a child and parent, and can have an effect on the best time for learning.

Braio, A., Beasley, T. M., Dunn, R., Quinn, P., & Buchanan, K. (1997). Incremental implementation of learning style strategies among urban low achievers. *The Journal of Educational Research, 91*, 15-25.

This article describes a study that was conducted by the authors in which a literacy unit on compound words, plurals, prefixes, suffixes, and contractions were taught to a group of 81 special education and 35 low-achieving general education students over a course of five two-week phases with accommodations made for individual learning styles. Students were taught with attention to the 21 elements of the Dunn and Dunn learning styles model such as sound, light, temperature, design, motivation, persistence, responsibility, and structure, and time-of-day preference. Students were also grouped for reading according to whether their energy levels were highest during early morning, late morning, or afternoon. The study found that significant gains were made in reading achievement with both special education and general education students who were taught incrementally using learning-style strategies.

Carbo, M. (2009). Match the style of instruction to the style of reading. *Phi Delta Kappan, 90*, 373-378.

According to this article the inception of increased time spent on reading instruction with programs geared toward the No Child Left Behind mandate did not show any substantial gains in reading comprehension or enjoyment for elementary school students. The author of this article suggests that that is because the incorrect teaching strategies are being used with this program. The author asserts according to the Dunn and Dunn learning styles method that a reader’s ability to read is affected by many factors including his environment, and suggests that reading instruction has to be matched to students’ reading style strengths and preferences in order for any real gains to be seen with reading instruction*.*

Cropper, C. (1994). Teaching for different learning styles. *The Gifted Child Today, 17,* 36-39.

This article describes a study in which 137 high-achieving fourth graders were assessed on their individual learning styles through a computer-generated learning styles inventory and a group-administered written learning styles inventory. The study found that because both tests gave similar findings of students’ learning styles that the learning styles were accurate.

Curry, L. (1990). A critique of the research on learning styles. *Educational Leadership, 48,* 50-56.

This article seeks to analyze the methods of research used to promote learning styles methods. The author contends that there are problems with aspects of the research including the definitions and instruments used.

Davis, Z. (2001). Effects of time-of-day of instruction on beginning reading achievement*. Journal of Educational Research, 80,* 138-140.

This article describes the procedures and findings of a study that researched whether reading instruction in the afternoon caused greater achievement for students than reading instruction in the morning. The study found that beginning readers who received reading instruction in the afternoon had greater gains in reading achievement than students who were instructed in reading in the morning.

Dembo­­­, M. H., & Howard, K. (2007). Advice about the use of learning styles: a major myth in education. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 37,* 101-109.

## ­­­­

## The authors of this article raise questions to challenge the belief that students should be instructed according to their own personal learning style preferences. They assert that there are unsubstantiated claims and unquantifiable research made by proponents of the learning styles model.

Doolan, L.S., & Honigsfeld, A. (2000). Illuminating the new standards with learning style: striking a perfect match. *The Clearing House, 73(5),* 274-278.

## This article asserts that the best way for educators to address the standards-based curriculum is to identify students’ learning style preferences and cater instruction to match them.

## Dunn, R. (1984). Learning style: state of the science. Theory into Practice, 23, 10-19.

With the countless number of supporters and positive evidence for teaching students through their individual learning styles, Rita Dunn, an early researcher and proponent of learning styles, is questioning in this article why it is that more schools and educators aren’t utilizing learning styles to teach students more effectively. She comes to the conclusion that schools often wait on hard evidence and empirical data before they implement innovative teaching methods. Rita Dunn seeks in this article to explain the learning styles model, and gives statistics behind why it works. She presents evidence found in studies that looked at learning styles as a way to present the usefulness of utilizing learning styles in instruction. She presents that one study found that the time-of-day preference between gifted and underachiever children is often different, and needs to be taken into consideration. Gifted children prefer mornings or evenings, but underachiever children tend to prefer late mornings or afternoons.

Dunn, R. (1998). Timing is everything. *Momentum, 29,* 23-25.

Preferred time of day is one of the contributing factors in the Dunn and Dunn learning styles model that affects student academic performance. This article opens with two anecdotes about individuals whose performances in the classroom were affected at various times of the day. One is about a student who fell asleep in class in the morning, but who worked well with homework in the evening, and the other is a teacher who was energetic in the morning, but lethargic in the afternoon. These anecdotes are given as examples to support the theory that the time of day students are required to learn does have an important impact on their ability to perform. The article goes on further to point out that many adults can identify themselves as being “morning or night people,” and know at what times of day they best perform. Dunn recommends that time-of-day preference be implemented in school scheduling, and points out ways this learning style can be put into practice in classrooms.

Haar, J., Hall, G., Schoepp, P., & Smith, D. H. (2002). How teachers teach to students with different learning styles. *Clearing* *House, 75(3),* 142-145.

This article describes a research study conducted by the authors in which they observed teachers at eight K-12 schools to see how teachers responded to students’ various learning styles. The article asserts that “ understanding learning styles makes a difference in teacher effectiveness.”

[Hodgin, J.](javascript:__doLinkPostBack('','ss%7E%7EAU%20%22Hodgin%2C%20June%22%7C%7Csl%7E%7Erl','');), & [Wooliscroft, C](javascript:__doLinkPostBack('','ss%7E%7EAU%20%22Wooliscroft%2C%20Caaren%22%7C%7Csl%7E%7Erl','');). (1997). Eric learns to read: learningstyles at work. [*Educational Leadership*](javascript:__doLinkPostBack('','ss%7E%7EJN%20%22Educational%20Leadership%22%7C%7Csl%7E%7Erl','');)*, 54,* 43-45.

Within this article, two teachers discuss the specific success they had with teaching a child to read by implementing some of the 21 elements in the Dunn and Dunn learning styles model in their classroom. They saw dramatic improvement in a child who was marked for special education simply by catering to his specific learner styles. These two teachers suggest that significant gains can be made within literacy instruction by paying careful attention to classroom design, and knowing and utilizing children’s learning preferences.

Ivie, S. (2009). Learning styles: humpty dumpty revisited. *McGill Journal of Education*, *44*, 177-192.

This article seeks to question what learning styles actually are. It asserts that the language used by learning style theorists is filled with ambiguities, so there is no real definition of what learning styles are or if they are even real. Tests that have been done on learning styles have yielded mixed results.

Kavale, K. & LeFever, G. (2007). Dunn and Dunn Model of Learning-Style Preferences: Critique of Lovelace Meta-Analysis. *The Journal of Educational Research, 101(2),* 94-97.

This article is a critique of the research done by M. K. Lovelace on the Dunn and Dunn learning styles model. The authors suggest that the findings of the research are invalid because of conceptual and practical problems and the use of biased sources from studies.

Lauria, J. (2010). Differentiation through learning-style responsive strategies. Kappa *Delta Pi Record, 47(1),* 24-29.

The author of this article purports that the best way to help students achieve academically and complete homework assignments well is to teach students to use individualized learning-style homework and study strategies, so that they can own their learning and differentiate for themselves. The author bases the article claims on evidence from the learning styles models.

Lovelace, M. K. (2005). Meta-Analysis of Experimental Research Based on the Dunn and Dunn Model. *Journal of Educational Research,* 98(3), 176-183.

The author of this article conducted research between 1980 and 2000 on the Dunn and Dunn learning styles model. The author suggests that her findings show that when instruction matches students’ learning styles, the students improve in academic achievement and their attitudes toward learning.

Muyskens, P., & Ysseldyke, J. (1998). Student Academic responding time as a function of classroom ecology and time of day. *The Journal of Special Education, 34,* 411-424.

The authors of this article conducted a study in which they studied the academic responding time of 122 students with and without disabilities in 10 schools in urban and suburban districts. Their research supports the claim that student learning is not dependent upon the time instruction is given, but upon the ecology and environment of the class.

Neely, R.O., & Alm, D. (1992). Meeting individual needs: a learning styles success story. ­*The Clearing House, 66(2),* 109-113.

This article describes how teachers at an elementary school in Aberdeen, South Dakota successfully implemented aspects of the Dunn and Dunn learning-styles models in their classrooms.

Pitts, J. (2009). Identifying and using a teacher-friendly learning-styles instrument. *The Clearing House, 82,* 225-231.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

The author of this article developed the Learning Styles Preference Indicator (LSPI), and seeks to explain the validity and reliability of using this instrument to determine individual learning styles. The author contends that it useful to know students’ learning styles, but the language and instruments used in the learning styles models can be vague. He asserts that using this device helps teachers better understand their students and plan instructions toward them.

Robinson, S. (2004). Time is of the essence. *The Times Educational Supplement, 4565,* 25.

This article discusses a study done at a school in Great Britain. The findings contradict findings of other studies that suggest students learn better when taught in the afternoon rather than in the morning.

Stahl, S. (1999). Different strokes for different folks? A critique of learning styles. *American Educator*, 27-31.

This article dismisses the learning styles model as a faulty assumption in education citing insufficient and unsubstantial research or measurable results.